



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 22, 2013

Ms. Elaine Nicholson
Assistant City Attorney
City of Austin
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas 78767-8828

OR2013-18376

Dear Ms. Nicholson:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 503062.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for all proposals submitted and the final awarded price for a specified request for proposals. Although you take no position on the public availability of the some of the requested information, you state the release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Black & Veatch Corporation ("Black"); Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. ("Burns"); KEMA, Inc.; NAES Corporation; Proven Compliance Solutions Inc.; Science Applications International Corp.; ScottMadden, Inc. ("Scott"); and Siemens Industry, Inc. ("Siemens"). Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, you notified these companies of the request and of their right to submit comments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Black, Burns, Scott, and Siemens. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you acknowledge, and we agree, the city did not comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a

governmental body's failure to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *Id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because third party interests can provide a compelling reason to withhold information, we will consider whether any of the submitted information may be excepted under the Act.

Next, we note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, we have only received correspondence from Black, Burns, Scott, and Siemens. Thus, we find the remaining interested third parties have not demonstrated that they have a protected proprietary interest in any of their submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining third parties' information on the basis of any proprietary interests these third parties may have in their information.

We further note a portion of the information Siemens seeks to withhold was not submitted by the city for our review. By statute, this office may only rule on the public availability of information submitted by the governmental body requesting the ruling. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested). Because this information was not submitted by the city, this ruling does not address Siemens' argument against its disclosure.

We understand Burns and Siemens to assert that their submitted information is confidential because it was given to the city in confidence. We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act through an agreement or contract. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110).

Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b). Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a trade secret to be:

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.¹ This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* ORD 552 at 5. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless

¹The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; see also ORD 661 at 5.

In advancing its arguments, we understand Burns to rely, in part, on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The *National Parks* test provides that commercial or financial information is confidential if disclosure of information is likely to impair a governmental body’s ability to obtain necessary information in the future. *National Parks*, 498 F.2d at 765. Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. See *Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration that the release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. See ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only Burns’ interest in its submitted information.

Upon review, we find that Black, Burns, and Scott have established a *prima facie* case that some of their customer information, which we have marked, constitutes trade secrets. Further, we find Black and Scott have established a *prima facie* case that some of their methodologies, which we have also marked, constitute trade secrets. Therefore, the city must withhold this marked information pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.² We note, however, that Black, Burns, and Scott have made the remaining customer information they seek to withhold publicly available on their websites. Because these companies have published this information, they have failed to demonstrate this information is a trade secret. We also find Black, Burns, Scott, and Siemens have failed to demonstrate how any portion of the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have they demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. See Open Records

²As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address the remaining arguments against its disclosure.

Decision Nos. 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110), 175 at 4 (1977) (resumes cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). We further note pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because it is "simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business," rather than "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review, we find Black, Burns, and Scott have established that release of their pricing information would cause the companies substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Black, Burns, Scott, and Siemens have not demonstrated how release of their remaining information at issue would cause them substantial competitive injury. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 661* (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 509 at 5 (1988) (because bid specifications and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative), 319 at 3. Consequently, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Burns also raises section 552.133 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure a public power utility's information that is "reasonably related to a competitive matter." *See Gov't Code* § 552.133(b). Section 552.133 only protects the competitive interest of a public power utility. This exception does not protect the interests of third parties, such as Burns. *See Open Records Decision No. 666* at 2 (2000) (statutory predecessor to section 552.133 enacted to protect municipally owned utilities from public disclosure of competitive matters). Thus, we find Burns has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.133 of the Government Code to its information, and the city may not withhold any of the submitted information on that basis.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.136 provides, "Notwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.*

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 481* (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

§ 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.


We note some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110 and 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/tch

Ref: ID# 503062

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Logan Toms
Partner & Director of Finance
ScottMadden, Inc.
2626 Glenwood Avenue, Suite 480
Raleigh, North Carolina 27608
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Martin Weiss
Controller
Siemens Industry, Inc.
400 State Street
Schenectady, New York 12305
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Graham
Senior Vice President & CFO
KEMA, Inc.
67 South Bedford Street, Suite 201E
Burlington, Massachusetts 01803
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Crystal Musselman
President
Proven Compliance Solutions, Inc.
Suite 101
200 South Execution Drive
Brookfield, Wisconsin 53005
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jeffrey J. Greig
Senior Vice President
Burns & McDonnell
9400 Ward Parkway
Kansas City, Missouri 64114-3319
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jack P. Grimaldi
Senior Counsel
Black & Veatch Corporation
11401 Lamar Avenue
Overland Park, Kansas 66211
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Glen J. Canavera
VP Marketing
NAES Corporation
1180 Northwest Maple Street, Suite 200
Issaquah, Washington 98027
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Charles H. Wagner
Senior Contracts Manager
Science Applications International Corp.
6841 Benjamin Franklin Drive
Columbia, Maryland 21046
(w/o enclosures)